DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 542 SP 015 246

AUTHOR Kimmel, Ellen; And Others
TITLE Curriculum Revision for Sex-Fair Elementary Education: An Analysis of An Intervention Model.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Women's Educational Equity Act Program.; University of South Florida, Tampa.
PUB DATE [79]
GRANT 77710
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *Curriculum Development; *Elementary School Curriculum; *Instructional Materials; Nondiscriminatory Education; *Preservice Education; Sex Discrimination; *Sex Fairness; Social Change; *Social Influences

ABSTRACT

A project conducted at the University of South Florida tested the feasibility of a social influence and public commitment intervention model to adapt extant sex-equity education materials for their incorporation into the elementary education curriculum. Faculty members whose teaching assignments included service to students majoring in elementary education comprised a curriculum change team that located, adapted, and field tested sex-fair materials for their respective courses. An advisory board consisting of local educational and political leaders, as well as persons with statewide educational responsibilities, reviewed the changes proposed by the project staff and suggested additional courses of action that might be taken to solidify the sex-equity gains. Project objectives are delineated, and a discussion of the implementation process and outcomes is presented as a case analysis. An outline of the advisory board structure is included. (Author/LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179542

Curriculum Revision for Sex-Fair Elementary Education: An Analysis of An Intervention Model

Ellen Kimmel, James Dickinson, and Mary Topping

University of South Florida

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ellen Kimmel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Ellen Kimmel and James Dickinson are Professors in the Psychological and Social Foundations Department of the College of Education at the University of South Florida. Mary Topping is a doctoral student in the Educational Research and Evaluation Ph.D Program also at the University of South Florida.

Running head: Sex-Fair Elementary Education

SP015246

Abstract

A project conducted at the University of South Florida tested the feasibility of a social influence and public commitment intervention model to adapt extant sex-equity education materials for their incorporation in the elementary education curriculum. Faculty members whose teaching assignments included service to students majoring in elementary education comprised a curriculum change team that located, adapted, and field-tested sex-fair materials for their respective courses without displacing or minimizing other professional objectives. An Advisory Board made up of influential local educational and political leaders as well as persons with statewide responsibilities reviewed the changes proposed by project staff and suggested additional courses of action that they and the project faculty might take to solidify the sex-equity gains. Project objectives are delineated and a discussion of the implementation process and outcomes is presented as a case analysis.

Curriculum Revision for Sex-Fair Elementary Education: An Analysis of An Intervention Model[1]

The purpose of this project was to test the feasibility of a social influence and public commitment intervention model to adapt extant sex-equity education materials and incorporate them at all levels of an elementary education training program.

The women and men who enroll in teacher training programs, among the most traditional and conventional students on any college campus, generally are quietly resistive to changes in societal practices even when those practices are inconsistent with guaranteed human rights and freedoms.[2] The teacher training faculty and programs which prepare these students, as well, often reflect a narrowly technical concern with the elements of instructional practices excluding, for the most part, even those human rights issues such as women's equity that have directly influenced school policies and practices. There is little evidence to suggest that teacher training programs will change in content or in practice without systematic, planned intervention programs that translate the sex-equity educational issues into technical, professional practices that are integrated into and diffused throughout the professional preparation program for pre-service teachers.

Reforming undergraduate teacher education is not an easy task as witnessed by the countless studies, monographs, and books on the continuing ills of teacher education.[3] Changing an educational program involves changing the practices of people as well as their course outlines, and it is this process element which most often fails to support or sustain any program changes.[4] Further, commitment as a variable influencing adaption raises the issue of cost as a factor in accomplishing change. Two main types of cost

emerge in considering a model for change. The more obvious type of cost is the level of institutional investment in personnel, time, and materials ultimately required to produce the revised curriculum. At a time when teacher education resources might be reduced, the anticipated cost, if large, is unlikely to be incurred by the institution without the advocacy of influential faculty or administrators. The personal cost to the individual faculty member requires consideration as well. One form of individual's cost is the restructuring of personal beliefs and values where they are incompatible with the changed instructional practices. Where the changes in the curriculum can be relatively easily blended with the content of existing courses, the personal and professional costs for the faculty are likely to be more acceptable than those incurred when entire courses or course sequences must be changed to accomplish given goals.

THE USF PROJECT FOR CHANGE

Using an undergraduate teacher training program and its faculty as the targets, the project to be described below tested a model for change in which support in the relevant formal and informal established decision-making networks was developed. Simultaneously, available instructional modules on sex-and-race-equity (WEEAP projects' products among others) were identified for use throughout the undergraduate elementary teacher training program. Educational and community leaders, college administrators, curriculum policy-making groups and the faculty engaged in selecting and modifying appropriate instructional materials interacted throughout the year-long project in a way that permitted timely identification of problems and their resolutions.

For purposes of convenient organization, this article will take the major project objectives and briefly discuss their implementation and

outcomes. We believe that while all the steps taken as part of the project were essential, faculty involvement and "ownership" was, and is, the key to any curricular change effort.

Form Active Network of Influential Academic and Community Leaders

Developed and Used Advisory Board

The development of an outside group supportive of the project was viewed as critical to the achievement of the project's goals. An Advisory Board made up of influential local educational and political leaders and persons with statewide responsibilities was established (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

It should be noted also that the College's Dean, Associate Dean, and Director of Internship were identified formally as members of the project and thus provided visible support as well as technical expertise to the project's efforts. Their participation, individually and collectively, included writing letters to University and College administrators supporting the project's efforts, encouraging elementary program faculty to continue their sex-equity efforts, recommending the project's efforts to other teacher education programs, and providing a detailed review and critique of the project's proposed curriculum changes.

The Advisory Board met for a day-long retreat in April, 1978, to review each of the curricular revisions proposed by the project staff. They also considered possible next steps for the project staff to solidify their sex-equity gains in both the curriculum and the policies affecting the recruitment and retention of students in the elementary education program.

Based upon the Board's recommendations, the project staff undertook the following actions:

1. Drafted alternative sex-equity language for College and University publications describing curricular offerings and procedural requirements.
2. Developed and proposed policy amendments to eliminate College practices that are sexist in intent or outcome.
3. Developed curriculum change proposals to be acted upon by the College's Program Policy Committee, a step that formalizes curriculum changes including new objectives or goals.
4. Developed proposals for changing state teacher education certification and accreditation guidelines.

Adapt Extant Materials for USF's Elementary Program

Recruited and Trained Faculty

Key faculty were identified prior to the proposal for funding's submission (see Table 1). Their formal training in Title IX content occurred through attendance at the CCSSO Region IV Workshop on Sex-Equity Education in Atlanta in November, 1977.

Acquired Materials

Throughout fall, 1977, and winter, 1978, an array of sex-equity materials was identified both through computer searches conducted by two library graduate students and faculty searches. Materials were then ordered, collated and reviewed by the faculty for their potential incorporation into the curriculum. The materials and/or their evaluations were organized into a mini-library file open to all education faculty. In addition, several hundred orders were placed for the University library to make selected materials available to the University community at large (USF

received a large library acquisition budget supplement at the time of the search, a fortuitous occurrence).

Planned for and Adopted and/or Adapted Materials to In-class Use

Project faculty met weekly throughout the winter months to report the results of their materials review and to discuss the content of and process for the course revisions. The sessions also served to raise consciousness and build commitment. At the end of the winter term, each project faculty person and the Director of Internship submitted a report outlining specifically how various courses in the elementary program could be modified to include sex-equity materials and concepts. The reports were subsequently reviewed by the project faculty and then by the project's Advisory Board at the April face-to-face meeting in Tampa.

Build Support for Project's Products in Elementary Program Faculty and Program Policy Committee

Established Formal Reporting Relationships

Recognizing the crucial link between curriculum reform and the support of the elementary program faculty, the project's staff were chosen to represent the curricular components making up the elementary education program. It was assumed that the project's staff members would continue to participate in their respective departments' activities and convey the project's goals and methods to their colleagues as well as to inform the project staff of their program's concerns about project goals.

The faculty comprising the elementary education program at USF is a large and heterogeneous one with respect to their departmental and disciplinary identifications. Formal links with the elementary program were established through liaison with the Elementary Program Advisory Committee,

a group actively engaged in reviewing and changing the structure of the elementary education program. The project directors met at the beginning of the project with the Elementary Program Advisory Committee to discuss the project's goals and the means proposed to accomplish them. Substantial interest in and support for the project was expressed by members of the Elementary Program Advisory Committee at that time. Continuing contact between the project and that committee was maintained through the membership of its co-chairs who served on the Advisory Board and project staff, respectively.

Because curriculum change is a formal process requiring college-wide endorsement in addition to departmental support, the project chose to include as its members persons who served as members and officers of the Program Policy Committee (PPC). Throughout the academic year the project's activities were reported to the PPC.

Disseminated Information About Project's Activities

During the latter half of the project's tenure, the faculty engaged in developing curricular change kept their departments and programs apprised of their efforts. Informal discussions and team or shared instructional activities led to "spontaneous" practical adoptions of curricular materials emphasizing sex-equity issues. A striking example of change formally occurring well beyond the project's expectations was the Physical Education Program faculty's adoption and immediate implementation of curricular objectives prepared by a project member of their faculty.

Other members of the project reported regularly to their departmental colleagues about the project's activities. There was no open, expressed disagreement with the project's goals or with the materials used during the course of the field testing.

Products Used by Faculty

The use of the project's curriculum products by elementary education program faculty remains to be established precisely. The project field testing was only completed in the spring quarter of 1978. A preliminary survey of adoptions for the current academic year indicated that the project staff members are using the sex-equity materials they adapted for their courses. The project staff member from the Physical Education Program recently reported that interns in that program are experiencing difficulty when they attempt to apply what they have learned about sex equity in education to their public school situations. This is, of course, a foreseeable occurrence.

The "proof" of this project as a curriculum change effort lies in the long-term (i.e., two to three years away) incorporation of sex-fair materials and instructional practices in the College's courses that comprise the undergraduate elementary education program. Such information is, practically speaking, inaccessible at this moment, but there are conditions reasonably thought to be prerequisite to long-term adoption that can be examined at this time. From a description of such "prerequisite" conditions, it might be possible to assess the likelihood of significant adoption of the sex-fair materials and activities in the elementary program.

Condition 1. Visibility of credible sex-fair materials and instructional practices. The likelihood that faculty beyond the immediate project staff would incorporate sex-fair issues in their courses is increased to the extent that there are: (a) visible sources of relevant sex-fair instructional materials available for inspection; (b) colleagues having similar instructional obligations (i.e. teach elementary education students and/or have common disciplinary background) who adapted sex-fair materials

for use in a course, and (c) the existence of practical (inexpensive in cost and time) sex-equity instructional procedures validated through field testing in the elementary program. All three elements comprising this initial basic condition have been accomplished through the project and are "in-place."

Condition 2. The project staff members continue to be visible and credible models of sex-equity educational practice. At this moment, the members of the project staff speak enthusiastically about their continued use of the materials they developed and field tested during the course of the project. All report having had useful discussions with departmental colleagues about sex-equity matters in the courses serving elementary education students. And, all indicated they intend to continue using materials that accomplish their primary instructional objectives as well as their goals in sex-equity education.

The analysis of this condition, however, requires an assessment of the factors likely to influence a project staff member's continued explicit support for sex-equity education in the elementary program. Among the forces most likely to continue the present enthusiasm of the former project staff are: (a) the presence of stimulating intellectual exchanges with colleagues on matters related to sex-equity education; (b) the number of positive contacts among project members during the year; (c) the encouragement and approbation of significant others for their efforts to sustain sex-equity education practices; (d) the formal endorsements of sex-equity objectives by their departmental colleagues; and (e) the formal adoption of sex-fair instructional units in any department's course syllabi.

With the foregoing considerations in mind, it is possible to identify significant differences in the social contexts affecting the individual

members of the project staff. On the one hand, the Physical Education Program faculty responded appropriately and rapidly to implement sex-equity practices in their program. At the other extreme, another project member's teaching collegues have little formal contact with one another, have no or little program identification, and lack a formal mechanism for acting on instructional matters as a coherent unit. It seems improbable that his colleagues will be collectively interested in or aware of his instructional practices. They are also unlikely to interfere with his continued use of sex-equity materials because there is among them a generally "liberal" spirit that, in an academi sense, supports sex-equity goals.

Among the early childhood and elementary faculty, the project faculty find active support for their use of sex-fair materials in course instruction. Most of the apparent interest in using these materials has been expressed by the female members of the faculty while the males' views are not yet apparent.

In summary, the departmental environments for sustaining the sex-fair course changes vary substantially, but appear to be generally adequate at this time. It is not clear, however, that departmental interests and energies will remain focused and supportive of the project's goals two years from now. Departmentally-endorsed and college-approved course objectives incorporating sex-fair goals and practices are formal steps needed at this time to institutionalize the gains that have been made in the past year.

As for the support to be provided by the College and University administration, the social influence model underlying the design of the project led to the recruitment of the College Dean, the Associate Dean for Programs, and Director of Internships as official members of the project. The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs also served on the Advisory

Board and provided an important link to the formal University-wide curriculum and course approving agency. The endorsement of the project's means and goals implied by their formal membership in the project presumably shielded the project from overt or explicit resistance by opposing faculty and, perhaps, tipped the balance in the project's favor among those in the College who were indifferent toward the project's goals. The effect of this strategy is particularly difficult to assess because, at the very time the project formally began, the Dean announced his intention to resign at the end of the 1977-78 academic year. His successor, neither a party to the design of the project nor a publicly identified supporter, was not psychologically obligated to behave in a manner consistent with the former Dean's official support. By virtue of the change in administration, at least one element counted on to provide stable support beyond the project's funded lifetime would now be missing in the social structure of the College. However, the other College and Universtiy administrators identified with the project remained and thus fulfilled a major structural assumption underlying the design of this curriculum change effort.

Condition 3. Visible and active support of male faculty. An unspoken assumption throughout the project's life was that a successful change effort had to overcome the resistance of male colleagues outside the project. The expression of general resistance, obviously interwoven with the unique relations of the male project members with their male faculty colleagues, appeared in the form of subtle and not-so-subtle allusions--generally in the form of jokes--to the sexual benefits available to males who supported the "libbers." More direct expressions of resistance from male colleagues came in the form of arguments about the meanings of sex equity and equality as appropriate educational goals irrespective of the statutory or legal

bases. Arguments were couched in suitable academic considerations such as the "evidence" for psycho-biological determinism--man, the hunter and nomad, etc. Another, and much more common expression, involved discussions of the salary equity adjustments for female faculty and the extent to which such adjustments were inconsistent with the male speaker's perceptions of the female member's professional merit or the objective facts of discriminatory salary histories for women faculty.

The presence of respected male faculty members on the project staff constituted discrepant perceptual figures for those males who viewed sex-equity matters in curriculum change as either misguided or trivial. Male project members, more so in the early stages of the project than later, found themselves confronted with the matters identified above and had ample opportunities to explain the reasons for their active involvement in the "women's movement."

Because attitude changes are influenced by (a) public expression of a position, (b) the speaker's "cost"--danger, punishment, rejection--for that public expression, and (c) the modeling of a value or belief system deviating from the norm, one can reasonably assume that there was a strengthening of the male members' attitudes supporting the project's goal and a weakening of the manifest resistance of male colleagues to those goals. As evidence of the latter, male colleagues in several departments regularly sent copies of research and professional articles dealing with Title IX implementation to the male members of the project staff. The frequency of jokes seemed to subside and the incidence of serious discussions about the project's implication for daughters, sisters, and wives increased throughout the year of the project.

The weekly staff meetings during Quarter II (winter, 1978) provided unique opportunities for serious and open discussions of female and male project members about the personal implications of sexism and sex equity. The shared explorations of personal values within the project staff fostered, in our view, a deeper commitment to fundamentally democratic and egalitarian values. The process uncovered a rich, heterogeneous set of personal views about the implications of sexism and sex-equity education efforts. There was a strong norm established to accept project members' views as legitimate, serious expressions of our efforts to understand and to cope with the problems arising out of our culture's biases. There was no party-line or dogma to be learned or recited. The emphasis upon individual growth in understanding and commitment made it possible for the male members of the project to be even more compelling (disturbing) role models for their male colleagues.

Assessment of Model

Anecdotal Results

As outlined in the section, "Products Used by Faculty," the faculty indicated strong intentions to employ the curricular changes they developed whenever they teach the modified courses.

Records of conflicts were minimal, perhaps in part because the activities of project staff were continuously publicized or informally discussed with colleagues and key administrators were participating and/or kept apprised of progress toward agreed upon goals. Some College faculty were perhaps puzzled at the extent to which the project was made public in contrast with the usual norm of isolation.

One unobtrusive measure of the project faculty's dissemination of the project's activities was taken by asking each project staff person to

check off each week any faculty with whom they discussed the project. Seventy-five different faculty colleagues (and several secretaries and uncounted students) not directly affiliated with the project were contacted, many of whom were contacted more than once by a project member or members. The total reported contacts was 270. Thus, a large percentage of faculty (75/130) heard about the project and had opportunities to ask questions. The data confirmed that (a) project staff shared and consulted with colleagues about their work and (b) information about the project was widespread. The fact that faculty knew they would be reporting their contacts might have increased the number of contacts they made. Thus, the measure might be contaminated, but the result a desirable one in terms of the project's success.

A systematic examination of the minutes of the College's (a) Program Policy Committee, (b) Personnel Policy Committee, and (c) Administrative Council for the school year 1977-78 revealed no attention to sex-equity concerns with the obvious exception of an outside consultant's presentation to the Administrative Council on implementing Title IX, delivered in the fall of 1977 at the project's beginning. A review of the minutes for the school year (1978-79) showed no mention of sex-equity concerns either.

Cost Estimates of Application of Model

The project's funding proposal outlined federal costs as $15,000 and in-kind contributions as $60,000. Since the project followed the proposal

closely, it is probably accurate to state that those indeed were the dollar costs for achieving the curricular changes. Some faculty may have expended more time than they were released and others somewhat less. Certain administrators did spend less time than estimated, but this was offset by the addition of the Advisory Board members' time (spent reviewing the five reports and attending the April meeting in Tampa). Since at least some of the expenditures associated with the conduct of this project resulted from the development of the model and its validation, the cost for an institution or program's adopting the model probably will be considerably less.

Pre- and Post-project Changes in Measured Knowledge and Attitudes

Faculty data. All eight project faculty and administrators and a randomly selected control group of matched counterparts, completed the Attitudes Towards Women Scale (ATW);[5] the Bem Sex Role Inventory;[6] and a locally developed 22-item questionnaire, Sex Equity in Education, that assesses knowledge of Title IX and reports instructors' in-class treatment of students. The latter begins with three items asking respondents to rate, on a scale of 4 - 1 (great deal to rarely), the extent to which they were involved in political reform, social reform, and religious activities. The fourth instrument, an opinion survey drawn from The New Left Scale[7], consists of 50 items, edited for sex-fair language, and self-report description of the respondent's involvement in reform action. This instrument was used to assess the respondents' level of discontent with the existing social order, a condition which might influence their reactions to the efforts of a Title IX change project. The measures were completed in the fall, 1977, by both groups and again in the spring, 1978, by project members. The control group of faculty were not sent the three attitude measures in the spring of 1978

since some had expressed resentment about completing them in the first administration. There was, as well, some expressed resistance among the project faculty, although they did retake them.

Comparisons of the experimental (project faculty) and the control groups' pre-responses on the four instruments revealed no discernable differences. Although the numbers were small and the differences thus would have had to be very pronounced to reach substantial significance, it can be said at least that there was no gross bias in choosing faculty to work on the project who were more "liberal," sex fair or knowledgeable than their cohorts. In fact, faculty were selected, first, because of their tenured, senior faculty status, and, second, because they seemed to be open to the goals of the project. In short, there is no evidence that the project staff was an unusually aware or activist group.

Post-project scores of the experimental faculty on the questionnaire that called for information about Title IX showed a systematic improvement in accuracy when compared to their pretest scores, which was not the case for the control faculty. This finding was the only one of note in as much as the differences in the pre- and post-scores on the other attitude scales taken only by the project faculty did not differ significantly. There was some indication in the self report of behaviors toward women and men students that the experimental faculty saw themselves as becoming more sex fair, but the sample was too small to ascertain if the reported changes are reliable. Further, the tendency to "lie" or to wish to look good could also account for the self-reported differences. Perhaps it could be said that the experimental faculty at least knew better what sort of response would "look good" as a function of participating in a sex-equity activity. There was an increase (more liberal) in the ATW scores of the experimental

faculty but, again, the sample was too small to make any definitive statements.

Student data. Undergraduate education students from five classes taught by project faculty (experimental group) and four classes taught by colleagues not working in the project (control group) completed the ATW and the Sex Equity in Education Questionnaire in the beginning of the third quarter, 1978, and at the end of that quarter. In addition, an unpretested control group of students from three sections of yet another faculty member not associated with the project in any way were asked to answer the same set of questionnaires at the end of the third quarter. A total of 53 experimental and 41 control students completed both the pretest and posttest and 78 unpretested control students took the set at the end of the spring term.

On the ATW, the experimental and both control groups scored similarly on the first administration (no statistically significant differences), and there were no significant changes from the pretest to the posttest administration for either group that took it twice. It had been expected that the students of the experimental faculty might have deliberately developed or modeled more liberal attitudes toward sex roles as a function or either specific instruction related to sex-equity concerns or through more subtle communication of more liberal attitudes by the project faculty. However, when the data were analyzed by sex, it appeared that some change in the opposite direction occurred for the 10 male students in the experimental groups. They obtained lower scores on the posttest while the scores of the female experimental and male and female controls essentially remained the same. Although there were only 10 experimental males, the change approached significance ($p < .10$), suggesting that the introduction of

sex-equity concerns may simply alienate male students while not changing female students. The possibility of such an unfortunate outcome suggests that change agents exercise caution in designing instructional materials in support of sex-equity issues, recognizing that the sexes might respond differently. In the present instance, it cannot simply be the case that women faculty alienated male students since three of the five experimental faculty were male.[8] As many other users of the instrument have found, the female respondents as a whole were significantly more liberal than their male counterparts both on the pretesting ($t = 2.16$, 46df, $p < .04$) and the posttesting ($t = 2.85$, 46df, $p < .01$).

An item-by-item analysis of the mean difference scores (pretest from posttest means) on the Sex Equity in Education Questionnaire revealed no significant differences between the 53 experimental and the 41 control subjects. When items were clustered in terms of the three dimensions measured, there were some apparent differences. The clusters were social, political, and religious involvement; teacher practices towards male and female students; and knowledge of Title IX requirements. When the experimental groups were compared to the pretested controls, the differences were positive (experimental scored higher--more involved, more sex fair, more knowledgeable) but non-significant. However, when the experimental groups were compared with the unpretested controls, the differences on the latter two dimensions approached significance ($p < .09$ and $P < .10$, respectively). It was important, then, to have the unpretested controls, since taking the pair of questionnaires apparently sensitized the regular control students. The differences between the two control groups were significantly on the involvement and sex-fair practices dimensions ($t = 2.07$, 117df, $p < .04$ and $t = 3.00$, 117df, $p < .003$, respectively). Such "slop

over" effects are not uncommon--at times it appears that perhaps only a gentle or light treatment is more powerful (perhaps less likely to produce counter reactions or backlash) than a programatic one.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

The introduction of sex-equity education issues into an ongoing undergraduate elementary education program was accomplished through the use of a social influence and public commitment intervention model. Composed of faculty whose teaching assignments included service to elementary education majors, the curriculum change team located, adapted, adopted, and field-tested sex-fair materials for incorporation into their respective courses without displacing or minimizing other professional objectives. An Advisory Board made up of influential local educational and political leaders as well as persons with statewide responsibilities reviewed the curriculum changes proposed by the project staff, recommended changes in the materials, and proposed courses of action that they and the project faculty might take to solidify the sex-equity gains. These suggestions were reflected in the final reports written by each of the project faculty members.

A variety of obtrusive and unobtrusive measures were used in the assessment of the project's goals and objectives. Evidence obtained through questionnaire data from staff and "matched" faculty revealed no significant differences in attitudes toward sex-equity either at the outset or at the project's conclusion. However, the staff showed significant improvement in knowledge about the facts of sex equity in education when compared with the matched sample at the end of the year. Changes in students' attitudes and knowledge of sex-equity issues were small, but in the expected direction, when the responses of students who completed the adopted curricular materials were compared with students who had no exposure

to the field-tested materials.

Evidence of the project's impact on the considerations of the College's Program Policy Committee and the Administrative Council was minimal when the contents of 1977-78 and 1978-79 minutes were compared with those of 1976-77. Diffusion throughout the College of the project staff's activity, however, was evidenced in the staff's membership on the previously noted committees and councils, weekly records of their discussions with colleagues about sex-equity matters, and memoranda and campus newspaper releases detailing the project's goals and methods.

A review of the project members' instructional plans supports the assumptions that the adopted sex-equity materials are both usable and useful. The Department of Professional Physical Education has officially modified its instructional goals to include sex-equity considerations, has examined on a course-by-course basis its offerings to identify and remove sexist language and practices, and has notified the authors of texts used in the department's instruction of sexist language and content. All former project members indicated they have or would be using some or all of the sex-equity materials that had been developed during the project's tenure.

How durable are the sex-equity gains in this project? It is too early to answer, but the continued presence of the project staff members provides a potentially supportive social network for one another's efforts to sustain their sex-equity efforts. The formal adoption of sex-equity issues into stated curricular objectives hasn't been accomplished at the levels of the College's Program Policy Committee. However, at the course level such changes are in place even though only one department, to our knowledge, has acted officially in behalf of the sex-equity efforts.

The USF case described in this report could be characterized as fitting the minimal change therapy mode.[9] Cost in terms of dollars and psychological stress were kept low through setting modest goals. Our strategy was to aim for small, realistic changes that subsequently might be amplified into significant long term improvements. Too often promising reform efforts, mounted at great costs, fail of their own ambition.[10] We hope ours will fare better. If nothing else, it seems reasonable to conclude that those who served on the project staff were changed by their experiences. The male and female members are now unlikely to tolerate practices that, unintentionally or otherwise, discriminate against women or men in the College of Education. Further, results indicate that the interaction among diverse elements served to heighten faculty's respective public commitment to the project's goals and thus provided, and will continue to provide, the impetus for additional implementation of curricular changes.

Footnotes

1. This project was supported by grant #77710 from the Women's Educational Equity Act Program (WEEAP) and the University of South Florida. Reprint requests should be sent to Ellen Kimmel or James Dickinson, Psychological and Social Foundations Department, College of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida, 33620.
2. Edmund G. Williamson and John L. Cowan. The American student's freedom of Expression: a research appraisal. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1966.
3. Paul A. Olson, Larry Freeman, and James Bowman. Education for 1984 and after. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.: Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, 1972.
4. Goodwin Watson, (ed.). Concepts for social change. Washington D.C.: National Training Laboratories, N.E.A., 1967.
5. Janet T. Spence and Robert Helmreich. The attitudes toward women scale: an objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. JSAS, Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1972, 2, 66.
6. Sandra L. Bem. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42 (2), 155-162.
7. R. Christie, L. Friedman, and A. Ross. The New Left and Its Ideology. (Unpublished manuscript, 1969. Available from the Department of Psychology, Columbia University, New York).
8. Dore Beach and Ellen Kimmel. Attitudes toward women: a comparison study of counselor trainees. The Humanist Educator, 1976, 14 (4), 209-220.

9. Leona Tyler. The Work of the Counselor, (2nd ed.) (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1961).

10. David C. McClelland. Managing motivation to expand human freedom. American Psychologist, 1978, 33, 201-210.

Table 1

Advisory Board and Project Staff

Advisory Board

Local -- Chair, Hillsborough County School Board

Director, Staff Development, Hillsborough County School Board

President, Tampa NOW (Professor, Hillsborough Community College)

Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs, USF, ex officio member, University Curriculum Committee

Associate Professor, Chair, USF Early Childhood Program

State -- Title IX Coordinator, Florida Department of Education

Consultant, Title IX, Florida School Desegregation Center

Project Staff

Title	Program	Assignments to Relevant Committees
Professor	Foundations	Co-director
Professor	Foundations	Co-director
Associate Professor	Elementary, Early Childhood	Elementary Advisory Committee
Associate Professor	Foundations	Program Policy Committee
Professor & Chair	Library & Information Science	
Professor	Curriculum	Elementary Advisory Committee & Co-Chair
Associate Professor	Physical Education	Program Policy Committee, Chair
- - -